

R E M A R K S

By this amendment, claim 1 is amended by combining the subject matter of claims 1, 5 and 7 so as more clearly to define applicant's invention in view of the art cited by the examiner. Reconsideration of applicant's invention as defined in claims 1-4 and 6 is requested.

By the office action of June 22, 2005, the examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce in view of Harris. Harris discloses separator shelf assemblies 68 associated with the respective impact blade assemblies 64, 65 and 66. Applicant's amended claim 1 specifically recites that the flow wiers are spaced approximately 1/4 to 1 inch on the discharge side of the associated thrust guide. This specific feature is not disclosed in Harris. Applicant determined this dimension through meticulous experimentation coupled with an extensive knowledge of collider technology. The result is the optimum particle size of the solids discharged from the collider. Since there is no teaching in the prior art of the specific combination of elements of applicant's invention as defined in claim 1, it is believed that the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be withdrawn. For these reasons, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 6 are believed allowable because they define further specific features of applicant's invention.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under the

judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, a terminal disclaimer will be filed when common ownership between the subject application and patent 5,947,396 is established.

From the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6 are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Walter A. Rodgers', with a stylized, flowing script.

Walter A. Rodgers
Reg. No. 27,380

October 6, 2005

880 North Island Drive
Atlanta, GA 30327